



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,116	05/22/2001	Farrukh S. Najmi	SUNIP298	9186

22434 7590 06/07/2005

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 70250
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER

OSMAN, RAMY M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2157

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/863,116

Applicant(s)

NAJMI, FARRUKH S.

Examiner

Ramy M. Osman

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This communication is responsive to the After-Final amendment filed on May 13, 2005.

Claims 1-12 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1,3-5,7-9,11 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yee et al (US Patent No 6,738,975) in view of Sundaresan (US Patent No 6,487,566).**

4. In reference to claims 1,5 and 9, Yee teaches a method, an apparatus and a computer program product providing service side filtering of a message in a distributed network, comprising:

(a) determining if the message is to be sent to a topic subscriber (column 3 line 60 – column 4 line 33 and column 22 lines 25-35, Yee discloses a service side broker determining a message to be sent to a subscriber);

Yee teaches a rules based engine for processing messages (column 4 lines 50-60), and also a data transformation component for converting the data format of messages (column 4 lines

Art Unit: 2157

55-67, column 9 lines 1-20 & 40-45 and column 10 lines 39-56). Yee fails to explicitly teach (b) determining if the message is an extensible markup language (XML) message that conforms to an XML schema specified by a selected XSLT filter; and (c) transforming the XML message to form a modified XML message. However, Sundaresan teaches utilizing transformed XML documents due to the flexibility of XML and its emergence as a web-enabling technology. Sundaresan discloses modifying an XML document according to XSL transformation rules, and outputting the modified XML document (column 1 lines 43-67, column 4 lines 1-40, column 6 lines 29-45 and column 12 lines 1-32).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Yee by determining if the message is an extensible markup language (XML) message that conforms to an XML schema specified by a selected XSLT filter; and transforming the XML message to form a modified XML message as per the teachings of Sundaresan due to the flexibility of XML and its emergence as a web-enabling technology.

(d) sending the modified XML message to the topic subscriber (column 11 lines 50-65, Yee discloses sending a converted message to a destination application).

5. In reference to claims 2,6 and 10, Yee teaches the method, the apparatus and the computer program product provided in claims 1,5 and 9 respectively, wherein the determining (a) is performed by a JMS provider (column 7 lines 55-67 and column 8 line 45 – column 9 line 10).

6. In reference to claim 3,7 and 11, Yee in view of Sundaresan teaches the method, the apparatus and the computer program product provided in claims 1,5 and 9 respectively, wherein the transforming is based up the specified XSLT filter and an associated XSLT engine. (column

2 lines 40-60, column 4 lines 1-40 and column 6 lines 1-45, Sundaresan discloses XSL transformation with an XML processor).

7. In reference to claim 4,8 and 12, Yee in view of Sundaresan teaches the method, the apparatus and the computer program product provided in claims 1,5 and 9 respectively, wherein if determining (b) determines that the XML message conforms to a different schema than specified with the XSLT filter, then sending the original untransformed XML message to the topic subscriber. (column 4 line 50 – column 5 line 35, column 10 lines 39-55 and column 18 lines 20-50).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramy M. Osman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMO

June 1, 2005



ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100